

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 CARL DAVID WHITE,

11 Plaintiff,

2:04-cv-2276-GEB-GGH-P

12 vs.

13 CA. DEPT. OF CORR., et al.,

14 Defendants.

ORDER

15 _____/
16 Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed this civil rights action
17 seeking relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate
18 Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local General Order No. 262.

19 On March 23, 2006, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations
20 herein which were served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any
21 objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within twenty days. Neither
22 party has filed objections to the findings and recommendations.

23 The court has reviewed the file and finds the findings and recommendations to be
24 supported by the record and by the magistrate judge's analysis.

25 On November 2, 2005, the court granted defendants' May 19, 2005, motion to
26 dismiss with thirty days to file an amended complaint with respect to the following claims: 1)

1 imposition of the R suffix caused plaintiff to suffer from increased risk to safety as to defendants
2 Rhodes and Jeff; 2) the claims against defendants Ceaglio and Schroers based on plaintiff's
3 failure to link these defendants to the alleged deprivations. Thirty days passed and plaintiff did
4 not file an amended complaint. Accordingly, on January 19, 2006, the magistrate judge
5 recommended that these claims be dismissed. Plaintiff was granted twenty days to file objections
6 but failed to do so.

7 On February 23, 2006, plaintiff filed a second amended complaint. On March 23,
8 2006, the magistrate judge dismissed the second amended complaint because it was untimely and
9 because it did not cure the pleading defects discussed in the November 2, 2005, order.

10 Because plaintiff did not file an amended complaint in accordance with the
11 November 2, 2005, order, the January 19, 2006, findings and recommendations are adopted.

12 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 13 1. The findings and recommendations filed March 23, 2006, are adopted in full;
- 14 2. The December 23, 2005, motion to dismiss filed by defendants Adams, Hough,
15 Moncayo and Gonzales is granted;
- 16 3. The January 19, 2006, findings and recommendations are adopted in full;
- 17 4. The remaining claims against defendants Rhodes, Jeff, Ceaglio and Schroers
18 are dismissed;
- 19 5. This action is dismissed.

20 Dated: June 6, 2006

21
22 /s/ Garland E. Burrell, Jr.
23 GARLAND E. BURRELL, JR.
24 United States District Judge
25
26